

**FISCAL NOTE**  
**SB 156 - HB 1083**

March 10, 2003

**SUMMARY OF BILL:** Specifies that a social security number included in a public record or document filed with the state or with a local governmental entity may be included as part of the record available for public inspection unless the holder of the social security number requests it be redacted from the record. Authorizes charging a fee for such redaction equal to the fee paid to record the document. Provides for all social security numbers to be redacted from all public documents and records distributed on the Internet by the state or a local governmental entity.

**ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT:**

**Increase State Expenditures - Exceeds \$100,000**  
**Increase State Revenues - Not Significant**

**Increase Local Govt. Expenditures\* - Exceeds \$100,000**  
**Increase Local Govt. Revenues - Not Significant**

**Other Fiscal Impact - Jeopardizes federal funding of \$230,000,000 for the Child Support Enforcement program and the Families First program.**

Estimate assumes:

- the state and local governments will experience an increase in expenditures for the costs associated with modifying existing systems and records for redaction of social security numbers.
- many affected records are stored on microfilm and removal of social security numbers from such microfilm would be technically difficult and costly. To the extent records could be removed from microfilm, the rolls would have to be reproduced without the redacted information.
- the increase in expenditures to the state and local governments is estimated to exceed \$100,000 each.
- the state and local governments will experience not significant increases in revenues from fees paid for redaction of social security numbers.
- federal law requires gathering and utilizing social security numbers in the operation of a child support program and requires the state to have a compliant child support program in order to receive federal funding to support Families First. Redaction of social security numbers from documents such as divorce decrees, driver license applications, and marriage applications would hinder child support enforcement efforts.

*\*Article II, Section 24 of the Tennessee Constitution provides that: no law of general application shall impose increased expenditure requirements on cities or counties unless the General Assembly shall provide that the state share in the cost.*

**CERTIFICATION:**

This is to duly certify that the information contained herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.



James A. Davenport, Executive Director